

M1513
Thursday, January 2 1969
San Francisco
Group I

Mr. Nyland: This meeting is Group I. Last chance of asking questions, huh? Let's talk first about a few things that perhaps are necessary to remember, and that I can be satisfied that at least I've mentioned them. Tomorrow John Marshall is coming, and it is sure that Victor and Barry will take care of, and bring him here—right? The reason for which he is coming: We have a few things to straighten out, particularly in connection with tapes and transcriptions and the index, and I would like very much to really do something in the next couple of months or so, until I come back, to see if we can establish something more worthwhile; although we have made a very good beginning with the different things, that it could come to a different kind of a level, and in that I think that everybody should understand that we are engaged in a certain project which concerns all of us.

In general, I think you fail a little in that; and I've used illustrations every once in a while, that when you're in a meeting each person should listen to a question, and each person of the whole Group should try to answer it by himself as he is listening. Someone will answer it, but the question is, how would *you* answer it; and then, of course, you listen to the answer. You have to become part of the Group, and if you are just sitting and waiting until something happens that you happen to like, you are not part of the Group. The responsibility for a Group is that everybody knows ... I would almost say knows what someone else is 'doing'; so that you have not only appreciation, but also an attitude towards something that is done for the general good in which you, also, are helping.

That kind of solidarity I don't think you have, but I think you can develop it. And I think you should, because it's very important. I use that question—business—only as an illustration, but each person should know what is happening with the Land in a general way—not in detail—

also what are we trying to do with transcriptions, what are we doing with tapes, what are we doing with the little room upstairs as a research, or whatever it is that the general aim becomes for us as a Group, and this is the nucleus of life in San Francisco.

To the extent that you really understand that there is a responsibility on that, to that extent will all of you grow. Otherwise you have just a few people who start to represent the Group as a whole, and the rest hangs on. And you should not do that. It should be below your dignity to just be a little bit of a supporting member. Each person can supply to the extent that he really is interested; and sometimes the interest may not be as strong in one person as in another, but there has to be coherence.

This is particularly applicable to one feature which is really a little bit shameful—that is, the question of borrowing tapes. You know it is a problem; and we all know that all of us are human so that we are forgetful and, sometimes, a little too superficial. I think it is really not right that there have been so many delinquencies, and that Kathy has had such a terrible time in trying to get these tapes back; and almost as if she is begging for it and then, perhaps, even be accused that she is telling you about a certain law which exists.

And maybe the rule of the six months is a little too strong and I would agree, but we had to try something because it was really in a mess before. I would suggest, simply, this: To use it as an honor system, and to have it understood by each person of the Group that they are under that honor system. I've asked for all the tapes to come back, and I think they are all back now. From now on they can be loaned out and each person who wants to listen to it has the time of one week to listen to it, and then has to return it. Now, there are always people who follow that up and actually are sincere and honest, and they deserve almost a premium compared to those who sin against the rule. It is really commonplace that they bring it back—that one would expect from anyone who has any kind of a conscience—but there will be people who have an excuse and are forgetful. Such people really do not belong, and should not borrow tapes. But if I make that kind of a rule, then of course almost fifty percent sometimes fall into that category; and then there is no reading or no listening to tapes, and then we forfeit a little bit the purpose of having tapes. So, that isn't right. If I say 'honor' system, I know there are also people who want to cheat, or who think that they are in a special class and therefore they have a little bit of an excuse because of this-and-that—their Grandmother died, or they have to go abroad, or they have to have a trip, or whatever it is.

There is one rule: You can keep it for one week. But I would like to ask those people who are adhering strictly to that rule and who have a conscience, to please put the others to shame when they fall down. It's really a strange kind of an honor system—that you are reminded by your fellow members; but they are entitled to it because they follow the rules, and if someone else is not following it then they will feel hurt and, after a little while they will say “Why should I do it, someone else is not doing it.” In addition to that we will post the names of the people who are delinquent so that you actually will be shamed into following the rule, and I would like to try that out. Because you know well enough if you see your name constantly on the bulletin board, you don't belong to this Group.

The question of Group II asking for tapes—all of that goes through the leader of the Group. Also the question that sometimes Group II members may be interested in a so-called ‘Group I’ meeting tape, that is up to the Group leader only—nobody else—and if he takes the responsibility, the Group leader becomes responsible for the borrowing of the tape by someone of his own Group.

I think if that is understood, you might say it is now morally ‘sewed up.’ There are loopholes in this if you don't want to work together, and really shame on you if from now on you don't follow these kind of simple rules. As I say—and I have said before and I say it again—if you do fail, such a person does not belong to this Group.

I want to say that, because the responsibility should be more and more emphasized about your own Work, about your relation to each other. And although I hope that that is something that can grow naturally, people have to be reminded every once in a while of the necessity that that must exist if you ever want to survive. Because if you don't do it now, you will never do it afterwards. And now is still the time to learn it if you really want to do it, and if you understand what Work means for you, you must understand also what it means for someone else. And, it is always on that kind of a basis that you unite. You don't unite as friends, or people you like or dislike you. You unite with a purpose in mind for growth for yourself, which purpose is not right now but it is a little bit away from you. And, in the uniting on that you eliminate certain personality traits which otherwise might interfere with you.

The patience of wanting to learn to understand each other and to be able to work together depends entirely on your wish to want to enter into the other person's life, and I think in that sense you are still a little bit infantile. You don't really know where other people live, and you

call them ‘members’ of this Group. It’s difficult to draw a line who belongs to Group I, and sometimes a little sentimentality comes in and you don’t really want to do it because you don’t want to hurt someone. There are problems when people are married or are living with someone, that you don’t want to leave the other one out; and according to certain rules you know well enough that the other person really doesn’t belong, but you become a little weak. I think it cannot be helped. Because if the Group as a whole is strong enough and if there are enough people who understand the principles, they will uphold the level and then a few people who perhaps do not belong, they do not matter very much.

I hope that this kind of idea, now, is quite clear. Because, what else would we do. I hope that gradually the different people will become a little bit more studious. I hope that gradually the level of these meetings in Group I can be raised. I hope that we gradually will attract certain people; I wouldn’t say of a certain ‘standing,’ but that there will be an influx of people who actually in their own lives, because of their own experiences are sometimes up against it, and that although they may have in life reached a certain level for themselves professionally, they still have maybe a certain spiritual development which is not sufficiently attended to. How to do this is a difficult thing, because you will have ... you have to have in your Group people who can answer certain questions which belong to the outside world and sometimes may belong to a little profession that you don’t know very much about.

I do not know if you exchange much of such ideas scientifically or philosophically, or that when you have read something that is of use that you communicate it to someone, or that you really work together in talking about such questions. Because you must not become too much ingrown as a toenail. You have to open yourself up more and more to the outside world; and of course Group III is supposed to do that, but then the contact with the people who come to Group III, you know well enough when you make it an open meeting more or less, you are liable to receive anybody who happens to have a little time without any particular interest, and it should be just the other way: You should get the people with interest who have very little time—and the time relates to *them*, that they know that *their* time is getting short.

How to select them. How to find them among your friends. You have to talk about it. You have to try to see how can you build up this kind of level a little bit more, and there are enough professional people among us that really you should have friends and encourage them or talk with them or show that there is a definite reason why they should become interested in the

ideas of Gurdjieff. I think you can be quite clear about it. I don't believe you think enough about it. Because you continue the way you are, you do have an influx of new people; and I'm not critical, I'm only reminding you that it is a necessity for you, *for yourself* when such people could come, that then you are forced to place the ideas as you now know them in a different kind of a light, and it will have to reassure you that there is really a reason why you are interested in this kind of Work.

The question of using the little room upstairs, the division of certain tapes in what I now call an 'original' file and for which reason I wanted all the tapes back, there will be a file which belongs to this place and will not be borrowed from. They will stay here. They will be upstairs in the little room for the purpose of anyone who is honest in wishing to study, who can then find out if the kind of tape he would like to borrow is the one that actually is that. Although the index might indicate certain things about it, it may be that you remember the wrong number or that the tape does not give the subject the way you would like to have it discussed or what you remember. So, for that it is a matter of sitting, and there will be a recorder so that you can spend the time in finding out what you want to know. But, no tape playing upstairs, and nothing of that kind that could interfere with any other kind of an activity here.

But, that is a minor matter, I think it is quite obvious. Loaning out music of Gurdjieff is not permitted, neither in records nor tapes. There is a possibility that you could buy one of those tapes, particularly what Peter has played, but you have to have permission and, for the time being Peter and I will be the persons who will give permission. The reason is obvious: I don't want that kind of music to be heard too much by people who don't know anything about it. Although it is published and certain records are available so one cannot prevent the buying or the sale of such material, at the same time when we distribute certain things, that goes under the aegis of us and I don't think we're entitled to do that. But we can sell ... and that, also, restricted. As far as the tapes of me are concerned, they are under no restriction whatsoever. It doesn't make any difference because I'm not ... I'm not particularly interested in that.

Now, the question of who can borrow transcriptions. The question of transcriptions of material which goes in the index, the question of the index, there are at the present time three different places where we collect material: New York together with Boston, of which John Marshall who is ... for which he is responsible; Andy in Seattle; and here I've asked George Bloch to take care of the correlation of such things in relation to other cities so that we can

exchange and also will receive from them, so that we don't duplicate and that we can work together. After I leave Albuquerque I hope to add Tom Harris to that as another place. That would mean four sources of information, and I would like in each place to have the same kind of information available.

You will have to help each other very much, and George will have his hands full in the beginning in trying to correlate and to make a little bit of order. Because it's not that you haven't done any work ... and I think that you have done very well—and particularly on transcriptions, where you have been very faithful about it—but also the question of making résumés, of being up to date, of having the things done correctly in the proper way or the proper number; or whatever has to be sent to New York or whatever you wish from New York, that kind of contact, I think, we have failed a little bit, and I'm quite certain that we in New York also have been at fault. So I think that John can help in that, and we will have a talk, before we go, with George to try to put in on a little better basis so that we can work together on that.

Borrowing transcriptions I think can be done, but again it has to be strictly adhered to—that such transcriptions are returned at the proper time. Whatever the time limit is for that, you have to set it for yourself. It may be one week, I do not know. Making transcriptions from tapes, that of course is not subject to one week. A person that transcribes may need more time, but also try to be reasonable about it. Borrowing of tapes is from a lending library and not from the originals; so that we don't touch them; so that at any one time all tapes are here, and anyone who wishes it can then use it for the purposes I have said. And if they then want to borrow a tape from the lending library and it isn't there, that tape first has to be copied before it goes out. This is a strict rule, so don't try to go around it and don't try to say that it is important you should have that tape. If there is only one copy and it belongs to the original, it stays there. And the person to copy it of course is Bill, and he is entitled to do anything he likes; and he is not under any particular rules of keeping tapes only for a week, he is busy as an engineer to try to protect all of you.

Now, that's all I want to say, I think, as far as general rules are concerned, and if you have any additional, please speak about it. If there is anything unclear, let's clear it up so that we then can forget about it and then we can talk about Work.

Yeah.

Questioner: In the little room we can go through and hear a tape, and just pick out, if we want it,

use that tape. Is that right?

Mr. Nyland: I would not play the tape there.

Questioner: That's what I thought you said. How can we tell what...

Mr. Nyland: You can play it to see if it is what you need, but ... so probably within five minutes you are through with it. You know? That much playing, but not the whole tape. If you want to borrow it you take it home and then you can listen to it there. And if it isn't in the lending library it's too bad, you have to wait until it has been copied.

All right?

Yes.

Art Andrews: In terms of bringing new people in, and people you've brought in, would you speak again, sir, on responsibility of the person who brings in new people?

Mr. Nyland: Whenever a person brings in a new person, that person who brings them in remains responsible until the Group itself becomes responsible. If he is brought in—in, let's say, a Group II—the leader of the Group becomes responsible after a little while, if he wants to take that. Supposing I have a friend and I say "You ought to go to San Francisco because there is a Group II there," I remain responsible until John is willing to take it over, and if he is not I have to tell the fellow to stay out. I keep responsibility until the Group has taken it. If I belong to the Group and I bring a person in, I remain responsible until the Group leader is willing to take it over from me. The reason for that is simply, when I bring someone I want to make sure that I have made the right kind of a choice, and I also remain responsible for the reaction on the new person of any ideas that are being discussed. So if I bring him once, it's up to me to find out what he thinks about it. From that I will know if I make the right choice or not, and I still have a chance to say "Well, it wasn't for you. Too bad, don't come any more." I think we are a little too flippant about bringing in new people to Group II.

Now, Group III is a clearing house. People can come into Group III and get out again the next week. It doesn't make any difference. Because, there is no particular reason to keep them if they don't want to. When they once go to Group II, it's quite a different thing. Group II simply means that I want to know about Work; so they are partly committed, and for that reason the Group leader becomes responsible for them.

All right?

Questioner: Is it possible to play a small section of a number of tapes if you're interested in one

you heard recently?

Mr. Nyland: For yourself, you mean?

Questioner: Yes, for me.

Mr. Nyland: Or, in a Group.

Questioner: For myself, I mean.

Mr. Nyland: For yourself, you mean?

Questioner: Within reason, yes.

Mr. Nyland: After... within reason. Are there simply not enough ... too much of a disturbance, it is already wrong. We have some difficulties at the Barn. We are under the same kind of problem, and I always tell people to have ear-phones so that they don't interfere with each other. They don't adhere to it. Every once in a while I come in and I hear my voice blaring all over the place.

Yeah.

Charlotte Lee: I've been trying to résumé all of the tapes; and one of the problems is that the same tapes that have already been indexed résuméd and indexed are listened to because they had been copied as well; and that there is an index and there is a résumé, and as a result we get numerous résumés on a certain number of tapes that have already been résuméd, and with those tapes which have not been résuméd, they have not been copied, no one knows what's in them and they're not indexed, and therefore no one refers to them.

Mr. Nyland: So, the problem is to résumé tapes that you have not résuméd as yet.

Charlotte: So we're going to have to wait until they're all copied ... wait for them to be copied before we can résumé them?

Mr. Nyland: Oh, no. You can résumé from the tape you listen to.

Charlotte: I don't mean ... um, the backlog of tapes which have not been résuméd, we undertook the project to try to résumé many of the eleven hundred and ten hundred series which have not ... no one knows what's in them because they are not indexed.

Mr. Nyland: I think it is good. You have to make the résumé, I hope it's worthwhile.

Charlotte: But this would mean that I would have to wait until Bill copies it.

Mr. Nyland: Oh. To take them out, you mean?

Charlotte: Yes.

Mr. Nyland: How would you live up to this. [chuckle] I don't want those tapes to be touched,

and if you know ahead what you're going to do, then Bill probably will be able to do it before you need it. I don't think there is any particular difficulty about it. You may have to wait once in a while, but if you arrange for it...

All right? You think it's a hardship? [pause, laughter]

Charlotte: Yes, it is. [laughter]

Mr. Nyland: The hardship is on Bill.

Charlotte: Yes, the hardship is on Bill, but it also, um...

Mr. Nyland: Not on you. You just wait a little.

Charlotte: I'm impatient.

Mr. Nyland: Yeah. Then you have to project your impatience. You have to project. You say "I'm going to be impatient next week if I don't get the tape." So today I ask Bill to copy it, there is ... next week I have the tape, I don't have to be impatient.

Charlotte: There's something wrong there. [laughter]

Mr. Nyland: There's nothing wrong with the logic.

Charlotte: What if we were to order the tapes in ... checked out of the original file to work -- [inaudible]--...

Mr. Nyland: Well, I still think that is wrong.

Yeah. Any other questions.

Kathy?

Kathy Differding: Um, one question, about a tape restriction for one --[inaudible]-- not listen to the tape? M29.

Mr. Nyland : Oh, I think by this time it's in the public domain.

Kathy: Well, I can then hear it?

Mr. Nyland: Ron, have you made any restrictions on 29?

Ron Chamberlain: Yes.

Mr. Nyland: You don't think it's right?

Ron: I was trying to adhere to what was the most recently I hear you say about it—that it was not for everyone to hear.

Mr. Nyland: I think I've said, in relation to old tapes, that there is no particular reason to listen to old tapes when there are new ones—that is, more recent ones—which maybe give a better idea of the subject discussed. But, it also depends on the kind of a person. If there is a difference in

adding material, or elucidated in a different way, as time went on, it was also true for people who are new that it is better for them to have simple tapes and those who are a little advanced, they can have tapes of a later date. But, how will one draw the line. I think also at the time I was a little hesitant; because although I do remember number 29 there are also other tapes of an earlier vintage, and perhaps I may have said certain things that I contradicted later on, so that in that I was perhaps a little apprehensive.

I think that particular objection can be removed. Because I know that several people have taken tape number 1, 2, 3, and apparently it was the same as what I would have said yesterday, so it is all right. No. I don't think there are any ... at that time we had general Groups, there was no Group I, II, or III or whatever in that period. I think many of the tapes of that time—the 300 series and the 400 series—could be very useful, but they are given out without my guarantee, I do not know.

What else.

Yeah.

Questioner: Can we do résumés or transcriptions at Clara Street using the original tape?

Mr. Nyland: Where would you do it.

Questioner: Down here.

Mr. Nyland: And how would you listen to it.

Questioner: With a tape recorder.

Mr. Nyland: And everybody else can listen to it?

Questioner: No, I could do it either with earphones or...

Mr. Nyland: If there is really a necessity for it or if you have a general activity day it may be useful, but in general, no.

You want to avoid that you have to wait for a copy?

Questioner: No, I don't think it's avoiding, I was just asking.

Mr. Nyland: Well, I mean, what is the reason. Would you like to do it here because of the atmosphere?

Questioner: Maybe. No, I don't --[inaudible, laughter].

Mr. Nyland: No, no. I know, but I want to know about the motivation of the question.

Let's adhere to the rule that we don't do these things here until there is a very special reason for having activity of that kind settled upon, then I think we should also have earphones

for it. So if you want to really ... for either listening or making a transcription, it should be done at a quiet place of your own home. It's in the nature of it. The listening one can spend an hour and a half, the transcription will take longer than that. And always one comes here for a definite purpose of Work, and on that ... but, we're really not set up too much for that, are we—for Work at Clara street during the week. No. So, for the time being let's see how it works out. When I come back we can talk about it again.

All right?

Yeah.

New Questioner: I noticed in ... at the Barn that people were making résumés or transcriptions. Would you recommend that?

Mr. Nyland: I don't mind where the transcriptions are taken or where the résumés are taken from. Same people prefer to listen to it, and then do it. Others like to read it, and over again and go back and forth, and then write. I don't think it matters. I think a matter of résumés, of course is also a rather delicate one. Some people make good résumés and others don't. Some take out subjects that appeal to them and leave the others alone, and... Whatever it may be, and whenever there is a résumé I would simply put it in the index file. For anyone who wants to study it afterwards, he may have to go through five résumés and find all kind of new things in them. A résumé should be signed by a person, so that you know who has made the résumé. And then you see that name and you say, "Oh well, that's no good." [laughter]

Questioner: The problem is the indexing.

Mr. Nyland: Yes, the problem is the indexing. Of course, if you cannot assume that the person who writes a résumé ... without having the subject, you know, and then it doesn't matter.

All right? All these things can be straightened out, I think, slowly; and that gradually out of that there should be people who really can make a résumé, and then you post their names as an example, etcetera, etcetera—whichever way we want to go to arrange the school.

What else. I'm anxious to talk about Work, so if we can do away now with this kind of chatter...

David Sherman: You've spoken about Working via triunity on one tape. You said there's two ways of Work—one by triunity and one for ABC's—and, uh, I don't understand the triunity. The other night you said if there isn't a little 'I' as a concept of Objectivity, it isn't Work.

Mr. Nyland: It will take a long time to explain it. I'll be glad to do it. I'll try to condense it

because ... of course I have said it and it is, perhaps, difficult to understand. Where's Bill? Now we come to the same subject, Bill—what happens when a person becomes unified in an attempt. We've talked about that every once in a while—when a person wants to pray and he actually wants to reach God, that *all* of him should be united in that aim. This forms out of a Man, whichever way he happens to be and whatever centers there are partly developed or some even a little underdeveloped, that there is an attempt made on the part of a Man using his personality to become unified in that wish, and to concentrate everything of himself regarding that wish.

What actually happens in such a case. Such a Man is made up, simply, out of a physical and a feeling and an intellectual center. When it is unified, there is a form of fusion into which the three parts try to unite, and the more unified he is the less there is of the divisions of the three; and in an ideal state that I would call 'fusion,' there is really none of the component parts but there is a unity of something that has started to exist because of the joining together of the three components. So the ideal state of that kind of unity is, that although it was made up of the three units functioning, for the purpose of unity the components don't exist.

You remember the example of water, gas—hydrogen and oxygen becoming water, and water under the influence of electric current is split up again into hydrogen and oxygen. The three components are hydrogen and oxygen, which are gases, the resultant is water which is a liquid. So in the chemical reaction, whenever something new is made out of components—out of materials, also chemicals—there is a new chemical made out of them with different kind of properties. It means that the unit is different in property as compared to the three centers which were before ... which were before the joining. When my aim is that with an 'I' I Observe myself as I am and I exclude feeling and I exclude thought, that what is then for the 'I' existing, is only that what is the physical manifestation without any interference of the other two centers. It is a form of unity in which that what is essential for me exists without the interference of the other two, and it comes to the same conclusion as when the entity exists as a three-unity, that none of the component parts play a part anymore. All that is required with the unity is that there is something that becomes Aware of the unity.

You understand that? When something in me says I am 'unified,' what in me says that? You see, that is an essential part of myself which does not take part in the unification. And I simply say it is either in prayer the voice of God or it is for me in my attempt to become unified that what is my Magnetic Center which wishes me to be unified, so I still have a division

between something that is a unity and something that is Aware of such unity.

When I follow the ABC's there is an 'I' which becomes Aware of me, but since that what is me is only the manifestation and the acceptance of that what exists, there is the same kind of a relationship; because I have excluded all the different so-called 'components' of my feeling and my mind ... which do not interfere with the Observation of 'I' and 'I' Observes the body, in principle the same state is reached. The question of unity is a little easier to understand than the question of the ABC, but when there is in me something that is Aware of me being—that is, the totality of myself—being One, that that what is actually taking place is a realization of this Oneness as a result of my wish to become One, and that therefore my wish in that way is Impartial to the totality of myself; because in the totality there is no more wish than the wish for the totality and no more wish for interference, so then that what is now causing me to become unified is Impartial to myself, and that's the same requirement that is necessary for 'I'.

I would say 'let it go' at that. I think I've said enough about it to let you think about it further.

David: Well, I ... but, it's a problem for me in the application of Work on myself.

Mr. Nyland: Yeah. Would you like to have the triunity road or the ABC road.

David: Well,...

Mr. Nyland: What is the difficulty in Work.

David: It's, uh, I ... well, I say 'stop' or 'slack off' very much in actually making definite attempts to have an 'I' Observe me.

Mr. Nyland: But you know, David, you asked me something earlier, and I told you last night ... and you told me something, it's *that* interference. I've said many times I ride 'one horse.'

David: This—what we're talking about at the present—we talked about it.

Mr. Nyland: Yes, it may be. You still adhere to it. I've suggested many times that anyone who is honest and serious about Work à la Gurdjieff, should spend six months and then not having any interference with any other kind of an idea that also exists. You never can give it that kind of attention, and you never will be able to find out if you ride more than one or two or three horses. It doesn't work.

David: --[inaudible]--and I can't discuss it right now, but--[inaudible].

Mr. Nyland: Yeah.

Jean Andrews: Um, I have some experiences of something that I don't know quite what it is. It's

as though some part of me that is within me that can know that there are certain conditions of my personality or of me, but at the same time there is that I'm not able to accept things that I see, but that maybe I will be able to later on.

Mr. Nyland: You mean when you Observe yourself that there are certain things you don't like? Is that what you mean?

Jean: It's not when I make an attempt to Observe myself.

Mr. Nyland: When is it. Certain traits of your personality?

Jean: The experience was once at the Barn and once out here when I was... I don't know. Just all of a sudden I knew that those were ... that what was going on was a result of my reactions and manifestations; and I knew that I could only accept it to a certain degree, but that maybe later on I would be able to accept more about myself and see that these reactions and manifestations were the cause of more manifestations. I don't know...

Mr. Nyland: Do you want to be responsible also for the reactions of certain people towards what you manifest? It's a very difficult problem. I behave in a certain way and there are ten people who see this behavior, I cannot be responsible for their acceptance or non-acceptance ... or criticism. I can make it as general as possible and perhaps as obvious as possible and if there is a particular reason for explaining I can explain it, but I cannot prevent certain activities to take place because of my behavior. In a Group if it is a definite relationship with any particular person, then I think there is a responsibility that whatever one says will have an effect. But then the response can be immediate and it can then even be straightened out or further explained, but when it is an effect on a group of, let's say, ten people, you cannot trace it, and many times that what you have done may have been not understood.

I say it's a very difficult problem to know how far one's responsibility goes, and it becomes more and more difficult the more people there are. But there are, among the people that are affected, several who perhaps are too superficial so that there is no influence on them; and there may be a few who in a particular kind of a state are too critical about what you have done; and it may be that some of them were hungry and were unaccountable, or some of them may have been really sick. Whatever it is that you did, if it is necessary to carry on and continue with what you have done, if you start certain things in motion in regard to the Group, you become responsible for that. Or, you may have an aim with a Group, that you want to try to see if that kind of a Group can respond to whatever you may suggest. Imagine, for instance, when as a Group leader

you make a statement of a certain task that you give to everybody. You are entitled to do that, provided you're willing also to bear the consequences of anything of that kind when they afterwards come back to you and ask a further question.

It depends, entirely on the kind of an aim one has, if you are supposed to teach or if you are supposed to lead people, or if you are supposed to bring a message and let it go, or if you are supposed to help people in education—like children. You become responsible for a group of people and you have to watch whatever you are saying, but in a general way when there is no such relationship it's very difficult even to trace what the result is of what you have said, and I doubt very much you are responsible for it—that is, in a general way.

Jean: I think that ... that there is more of an acceptance of myself. It's as though some part of me can accept what I do, and another part of me that can't.

Mr. Nyland: But then it is another problem. Then it's not the problem of the effect of others, it's the problem of you saying things for which you partly want to be responsible yourself—or not ... or cannot be—or whatever you may have said may not have been right from your standpoint. That is, it is your Conscience that then starts, not as a result of whatever the reception was on the part of other people.

In both cases, of course, it is always the question of what you have done; to what extent that you want to remain responsible for it, and if you have a feeling that you have said certain things which you should have said differently, or that you were afraid that perhaps the others had misunderstood and then you feel sorry, or that you feel that whatever you have done you could have done better and you will do it better next time.

But, don't lean over backwards too far. Because many people you know want to feel guilty even when they are not, and many things are said in a very superficial way which you need not worry too much about. If it's a state for yourself in which you consider yourself as a person who said this-and-that, the question for yourself is: Where did it come from within yourself.

Jean: Well, that's...

Mr. Nyland: That is the point, isn't it?

Jean: Yes, it is.

Mr. Nyland: That's right. There is something always, particularly afterwards when you start to think about it, that you consider yourself; and then you start to measure in reference to something that is already in you, and that what you have done is then judged by that kind of a standard.

It's quite possible that the standard is too narrow, and that's your condition. It's quite difficult to live with. The solution is not to say too much, or to change your standard. But, you see, that is always. Because, each person is conditioned. It doesn't matter where they come from. Because of education and influences in early youth, and what we talked about yesterday as far as religion is concerned and all the different customs and whatever may have been the conditioning wherever it came from; and that produces in me a certain standard, let's call it 'morality' but it is definitely subjective ... and if I now in the midst of that start to say certain things and I consider myself having said it, my judgement is many times quite subjective. And, maybe it's a very good thing to loosen it up a little bit. If my subjective morality tells me I shouldn't swear, I think it would be very useful to do it; to see if actually the reason why I don't want to swear has any definite reason for existence, or if I can stand myself if I do swear and what is it in me that objects to it ... and all the different forms of rebellion about my own behavior, why do I have them and why can't I be free from them. And whatever the conditioning is in early life are carried over many times for many years, and I hang on to them and maybe I should throw them out of the window someday.

[chuckle] This is not easy, is it. Because the window is closed, and I need an angel to open it.

What other things.

Keith Andrews: I ... after I've Worked on myself for a fairly sustained period of time, I can go for several hours or so, or maybe even more, and then suddenly I will be there, ah, when nothing ... I hadn't been Working at that particular moment and suddenly I'm just there. I talked with Ron about this in various meetings; and many people seem to have had this same experience, and the consensus of opinion is that it has to do with that period of Work I did several hours before. But, how does this all connect up. Why does it happen later.

Mr. Nyland: When I Work, I make a deposit in my bank. You see, any time that I make an attempt I introduce something in my psyche which is different; because I give it the possibility of becoming Objective, and it becomes material ... the facts that I then receive—and receive in an Objective sense—will constitute a certain form of knowledge about myself, *that* I call a 'deposit' in my bank of knowledge. Sometimes I can draw on it, and sometimes I leave it there.

Now, it depends entirely how much this deposit accumulates, if it is going to be useful to me ... and I want to draw on it I can then say "Yes, I know what it is to be Awake ... Now I want

to be Awake,” I now use whatever has been deposited because it is available as a result of my attempts to Work. Sometimes because of certain accidental happenings that what is deposited, the bank notifies me that there is too much. It’s a funny bank. [laughter] You know, a certain way that in life when there is something extra, it has to be utilized because if it isn’t it deteriorates. And this is what I mean. When my life is actually adjusted to the possibility that I wish to become Objective or Conscious, then many things in me physiologically are taking place because of that kind of a direction that I’ve set my life into or in what direction I would like my life to go, and because of that situations happen in which there is more possibility of an acquaintanceship with Objectivity because I am more open. As a result of that, certain conditions in life become, now, important for me which reminds me that I have a deposit in the bank, and then all of a sudden it happens to come out. And it looks as if I didn’t do anything about it, but it could not have happened unless I had Worked before, or unless my physiological condition has changed.

Keith: It’s a dividend.

Mr. Nyland: I don’t think it is yet an investment. I think it is still drawing on what actually is there that belongs to capital, and is not as yet a dividend. The dividends start only when the investment—that is, the deposit—is used for definite purposes in relation to Work. Then I will have a dividend.

Keith: To Work, or to ordinary life?

Mr. Nyland: No, no. To Work for oneself. If I use my money to invest it further in the possibility of having an experience, I will derive a dividend by the increase of my level of Being. That is the Work.

All right? Good.

Charlotte: You said that this comes about because there has been a physiological change. What brings about the physiological change.

Mr. Nyland: The fact that I’ve set my life in a certain direction where the accent is more on the possibility of inner life than outer. If I now regulate what is a feeling or a thought and I start to discriminate what are the good thoughts for that purpose and the good feelings for that purpose, I change my life. The result is that the thoughts that I then will have having more value, require on the part of me more pondering. The feelings which I have now for myself when I become interested in Work changing over to an emotional state, introduces in my life certain concepts of

God or the universe, or that what is higher than I am. As a result I get in myself a different arrangement of the kinds of thoughts and the kinds of feelings, and that produces in me a certain state which affects the different glands that I have, or it may even affect my blood circulation.

There's no doubt that the thoughts I have will produce a physiological change. Imagine joy—what does it do to one. Exhilaration—what is it. Increased blood circulation? Respiratory? Breathing, inhaling more air, extracting more from air, breathing deeply? All kind of different changes take place.

Charlotte: When you say “Work with joy,” is that what's supposed to happen? [laughter]

Mr. Nyland: I only take it as a theoretical question. [laughter] I think it can happen. We talked a little bit about that the other day—about the change of state when a person laughs at dinner. You remember? When did I say it. Not so long ago.

Someone: Yes.

Mr. Nyland: Yeah, right: Then you have better digestion. You enjoy a meal much more and you extract much more from it when you're with company and a couple of good jokes. I think we're constantly subject to it. When it rains and I want to do something and I'm mad, I definitely get physiologically in a different state, and there's no doubt about the psyche having an influence on my condition. The mind over matter—maybe you don't want to believe that.

Yeah.

Harry Strauss: What can be done so that it will be easier to accept myself.

Mr. Nyland: I don't know. Is it so difficult? Really? Start accepting yourself when you are in the right condition. That is, make absolutely sure that you do accept yourself without criticism, and then start doing certain things that are on the borderline of the bad. Not much. You still have control. There are some things you cannot accept. You, of course you can be critical about yourself and in the midst of that you say, “Now let me Observe myself and accept myself,” it's impossible. But when you are in a good state and you accept yourself and then you start a little bit edging toward the possibility of getting a little angry—a little—you see, you can still retain this acceptance.

After a little while you will see yourself much more as an instrument—when you Work with it like that—so that you create certain states which are under your control. Not very much yet because you cannot afford it, but after some time you become familiar with that kind of a state, and since it is self-induced it's not so difficult to accept. And from that, it is a little step

further, of something that is induced by someone else; because your reactions are the same, and when you have familiarity with the fact, you say “That’s me.”

Harry: What if I find myself in the middle of the situation.

Mr. Nyland: Then it’s too late. You know, when you’re drowning you better drown. [laughter] Yeah, it is always so idiotic—that one thinks that in the middle of a difficult situation, you can Work. If I am engaged in something that takes me all up, then it’s absolutely no chance of any energy to even think of an ‘I’, let alone making it. My old cliché of the watchmaker who has been running around the block and then thinks he can repair a watch and his fingers shake, how can he do it? It’s idiotic to assume that, and everybody starting out in Work when it is really ... uses the most difficult situations in order to prove that it cannot be done. And they always ... in the midst of their profession they will start to Work. And the golden morning is there and the lovely evening when they’re all alone and there’s no disturbance—nobody thinks about Work, but they only think about it when the boss comes in and then they have something to say. And they are in a delicate situation over the telephone—it’s so stupid, how can they. Let’s say someone is interested in that kind of a thing because one’s life is, like you’re completely conditioned because you have done it all your life, and then one assumes that just with one little instance of Objectivity one can undo all the years of unconsciousness. It’s idiotic on the face of it, even, but the trouble is that when one tries it and it doesn’t work, that then of course you’re going to blame Gurdjieff, and of course you get discouraged.

No, start with very small things and build up something that is what I call ‘deposit’ in the bank, then when it’s really ... you have to pay ten thousand dollars, pay it with the deposit. But do it, now, because there’s no sense thinking about it and saying “Yes, I will do it.” We talked about that last night. When you say, “I want to Work,” Work then—right then—and not later.

But, at the same time you have to have hope that you can overcome it. Usually there is ... that kind of a thing is an acquired characteristic. It’s not inherent. If it were inherent—part of your biological character or part even of your astrological chart—it may be a little bit more difficult, but much of this form of behavior is an acquired characteristic, sociologically adjusted in accordance with whatever you have experienced. And these things can be undone. Because they have been at a certain time acquired—laid on—and you really ... you can scrape them off. It’s a question of a little Will power, honesty, of really wanting to get rid of it and saying, “I don’t want it, it doesn’t belong to me.” It’s not me. Someone else happens to have given it to

me and I don't want it anymore, simply send it back.

Yeah.

Jerry Lindsay: Could you talk about the separation between the 'I' and 'It'?

Mr. Nyland: What's there to talk about.

Jerry: Well, sometimes it's ... I experience it as a clarity, sometimes of intensity, sometimes it's very cold, and I don't have an accurate...

Mr. Nyland: What is cold.

Jerry: Well, like distant, or that it is Impartial to me.

Mr. Nyland: All these things can happen to you.

Jerry: And so they're ... all I get is ... it seems that ... I think I'm looking for one that would be Aware of me.

Mr. Nyland: You're looking for a pass key. It won't work. There all kind of situations that are quite different, and whenever the 'I' is born it is difficult to make it be born the same way all the time. But the 'I' comes from me because I create it, and although I do my best at a certain moment I'm probably different from another moment, and in both cases I may have the wish to create an 'I'. So the result is that such birth of the 'I' may give me a child that is a little bit 'strange' to say the least. But, it is still my child; so, you see, I acknowledge that, and then I hope it will grow up—maybe a little crooked, and the legs might not be straight, and it may have difficulty in breathing air. [laughter]

All right?

Judy Jacobs: Well, when you were talking before about the triunity, it seemed to me in listening to your description that that would be the state that I'm in when I'm open to something to Observe me.

Mr. Nyland: I think that's right.

Judy: Is it?

Mr. Nyland: That's right. One combines it every once in a while—because of the wish to have something that can be Observed—to have that with as little hooks and eyes as possible; so that the 'I' when it starts Observing, really finds something that is not too rough, that it is actually something that is almost homogeneous.

It's also a result when I wish to create 'I' as something that represents God for me—I then become unified in that wish—so, you see, there are all the time these reverse possibilities.

Sometimes the 'I' is emphasized, sometimes the state of myself, sometimes there is an interchange between the two. Because there is constantly a thought or a feeling that goes across to the 'I' and tries to feed it and remember it ... and remind the 'I' that it has a task. When I finally get through with this kind of beginning Work and when there is an Awareness that I know as an experience and a state of Awakening that I know definitely something is Awake to me, then there are always three things—the 'I', 'It', and the relationship—and then it becomes important for me because... I've explained that a few times: When 'I' is Aware of 'It', that what is 'It', now being under the influence of 'I' as light, becomes aware of the existence of 'I'. And this becomes very important; because when there is a combination of certain things within in which all of them are pointing towards the knowledge of my existence and towards the feeling of my existence, the knowledge is linked up with an intellectual pursuit, the feeling is linked up with my intuition; and that what is three for me in becoming One will now unite the 'I' with me as I am as 'It', and will leave room for the combination of the two in which that what is a relationship becomes less and less intense. Ultimately the triangle is reduced to the Oneness as a result of the Participation of 'I' and 'It'.

All right?

What other questions?

Yea.

Harriet: I think the most ... one of the things I have a lot of difficulty understanding is how to keep myself skeptical, and how to keep from being a true believer. Because the important thing is—in the beginning what you assured me about going ahead with this whole thing—was that I have to have an Objective faculty that would have the knowledge, and so you said something like “Don't believe in what I say or what Gurdjieff says and don't believe anybody, find out for yourself.” And I know that it's important and I keep it, and yet I find myself thinking about things and saying, “Oh, Mr. Nyland said that, or Gurdjieff said that,” and I find the skeptic gone. Because I work very hard at it, and in the whole process I become a true believer. And it shocks me, because I know that it is important to be ... because I want to reach something all by myself.

Mr. Nyland: Well, you can always say “Mr. Nyland said that, or Mr. Gurdjieff, but I don't believe them.”

Harriet: But when I say it ... you know, it's only once in a while I catch myself at that, and I realize that's most of my...

Mr. Nyland: Yes. But then you try to find out for yourself. They say “If I do this-and-that and that-and-that-and-that will happen”—right?—I don’t believe them, but I’ll try out ... try it out. I’ll find out. If it turns out to be that way I can say I can believe them, but if it doesn’t turn out that way you say I have a ‘perfect right’ not to believe them.

Harriet: But ... see, I believe you, because it’s turned out.

Mr. Nyland: Oh! [laughter] So much the better—[laughter]—when you have experience so that there was actually a reason why you could trust it. There’s no objection in trusting someone. We do that all the time. It is only a sad thing when it isn’t.

Harriet: Oh, I don’t object to trusting you.

Mr. Nyland: No. Aside from the fact that if you do trust and you find out for yourself that that was really applicable in your case, the trust of course remains but it is substituted by something that now you have as truth and all you can be is, let’s say, ‘grateful’ if someone shows me the road of how to get to Clara Street and I finally get there. You know, it is like that. But it is all the time that a person is *very* much interested in taking over what someone else has said. And sometimes, because the other one says it, it’s easy...

Harriet: Uh-huh.

Mr. Nyland: But, that is not the way we want to Work. When someone says, “You ought to try that,” I have to try it. Then when I try it and it is so, I don’t care anymore who told me, really.

Harriet: Yes, it’s not ... is that I find myself not testing it, and just accepting it as my knowledge when it’s not.

Mr. Nyland: Well, when it’s your or my mind then we both can agree on that, and when it is knowledge and it becomes tested and it proves to be right, it even might become universal. There’s no problem involved. One hangs on to a person long enough until you can stand on your own feet. I think there is a point at which one leaves mother’s skirts and doesn’t want to hide behind it any more. There is a point in which a young man starts to go out into the world and proves to himself that he doesn’t need father and mother. When I once and for all know that there is something in me that I consider a Conscience or a solidarity or something that is there when I want to call on it, or even if I say “Yes, I know God exists because any time I pray He is there for me,” whatever it may be, then I stand on my own feet and then I say, “Thank you very much.”

All right?

Harriet: Yes.

Mr. Nyland: Yea, that's right.

Howard Cheifetz: Would you say that personality, when it's Sensing my mind is still then, but it's not Objective. What is left, then. It's not personality but, uh...

Mr. Nyland: Oh. I think the personality is hundred percent subjective, excepting one little thing which is the center of the personality which is Objective, and this is the point of oneself which does not change. That, you might say, is the assumption. Otherwise Man never could have any ideas about Objectivity. The fact that I say that there is a possibility of Objectivity must mean for me that I could reach it, otherwise I wouldn't think about it.

Now, if that what I am now as personality could become totally Objective, that what I am at the present time still has a function to fulfill, but the relationship is different. If I'm unconscious now, my body predominates, my feeling exists, and my mind more or less follows what my body wants to tell. I can have belief in my mind that it is marvelous, but when it really comes down to it my mind and my feeling are located in my body and my body, when it doesn't want to eat my feeling and my mind also die. So the body knows this damn well—it's more important than the mind and the feeling—and because of that the body has such power over us. Because if the mind says "Don't eat," the body says "You better, otherwise you will die."

So, what happens. The place of the body in relation to the other two centers is just the wrong place. That is, if the body is positive and the mind is negative and the feeling is neutralizer—just to assume it—it just ... it should be reversed: The Consciousness—the mind—should be King, that what is the servant should be the body, and that what is the emotion should be the Queen, and that would be a good family. So you might say the body has to be 'dethroned' but it remains as servant; that what is Consciousness is the result of a mind developing into Objectivity; that what the feeling center changes into is an emotional state, both as a result of Work and receiving, then, Conscience of a certain kind.

So, it is not the ultimate elimination of the physical body. That's ... in the first place it stays and it still considers itself important, because it furnishes food for the maintenance of a body in which Consciousness and Conscience happen to reside. So it has an important part to play, but it is not of prime importance anymore because it has become subject to something else that is more ... that is superior. So it does not mean that the change of the personality eliminates the physical body at all, it only puts it in its proper place; and when there is a Consciousness and

a Conscience, the condition of the physical body will change in accordance with the state in which it now is, which is a servant. And the servant has to be healthy enough and it has to take care of itself, but it is an entirely different thing—from being a king or a servant.

In the personality ... case of personality, it is still assuming too much authority. In the case of an Individual the body has found its proper place; and what a Man should become is a three-unity of the three bodies, and he hopes to be able to achieve that before the physical body dies. If it dies prematurely it's just too bad, and perhaps he never will reach it; and whatever he doesn't reach he has to do after he dies physically, and his life has to live in a certain way in order to develop further.

There's another way of looking at it, a little differently. If I want to build a Kesdjanian body and if the ultimate aim is to have a Soul and if life has to live in that, there is a certain necessity of equipping the emotional body with something that is at the present time within me. That is, if I have a feeling and the feeling is the beginning of a Kesdjanian body which is an emotional body, there is something as a beginning which is substantially emotional because it will keep, for the emotion, as if it starts the creation of a house. So not everything that I have at the present time I have to throw away; and many times I've compared it to moving from my physical body to my Kesdjanian is like moving from one house to another, and out of the physical body—in the surrounding in which I live now—I select a grandfather's clock and I put it in the Kesdjanian house. I select that what is useful ... that what is still subject to certain possibilities of dying, but when they are more emotionally tinted I have a better chance that they survive. So I go over with a very great simplicity, but nevertheless with a certain necessity: What is there in Man that could be, and remain, in the presence of God.

That is really the question: What is there that I consider for myself permanent enough, or at least more enduring than my physical body. Because if I move, if there is a possibility of moving to a Kesdjanian body, I am then subject again to a law of destruction after a certain time length which is the time for the life of my Kesdjanian body which is different from the physical, but I still have to have certain things with which I can live, and that I carry with me. And the rest, whatever it is, it will become dust .. and when there is no life in it, it has no value—not anymore; it becomes like Earth.

Not confusing?

Howard: It's clarifying.

Mr. Nyland: Okay.

I have to look at the tape to see what time it is left.

Engineer: Two minutes. A little bit more than two minutes. Three minutes?

Mr. Nyland: A three-minute question.

Yeah.

Penny Petler: I don't know if you can answer it in three minutes.

Mr. Nyland: Oh, I don't know, we can always make it a one-and-a-half.

Penny: It's really bothering me, so I'll ask it.

Mr. Nyland: It is what?

Penny: It's really bothering me, so I'll ask it.

Mr. Nyland: Ask it. Maybe I can't answer it.

Penny: My child's in a bad state with me, and so I'm in a state where I don't know what to do; and part of me says "You're not in the right state to deal with it" so don't do anything, and the other part says ... my feelings come in and my imagination and build it up to this huge thing so that I do act on it and then I see, by acting on it, that I was in no state to act on it, and...

Mr. Nyland: Does it get worse?

Penny: Yeah.

Mr. Nyland: What's the matter with the child.

Penny: I don't know.

Mr. Nyland: Then you're a bad mother.

Penny: Yeah. Right.

Mr. Nyland: And of course it's a bad child.

What will you do now. Can't you change? Can't you be a better mother?

Penny: The only answer that I know is to Work, and it's not really...

Mr. Nyland: No, not Work. It won't help. What is it that bothers the child. Why is it bad.

Penny: I can't say, because my imagination runs away with me.

Mr. Nyland: Now wait a minute. Here is a little child and the other person. Can it talk? Not yet. So you have to judge by your own wisdom. Do you feed it enough? Do you really take care of it? Does it sleep enough? Is it healthy? What is the matter with it.

Penny: Unhappy.

Mr. Nyland: Unhappy? How old.

Penny: Two.

Mr. Nyland: Give it more toys. What's unhappy with a little child there. If it is fed, sleeps enough, if it's healthy—what else. Why should it be unhappy. Because you spoil it ... when it cries you pick it up? I don't understand the unhappy state of the child, unless there is something the matter with the child.

Penny: Well, I'll give you an example. I don't really like to bring it up in here, but I feel like ... I put it to bed and she carries on so terrifically that I'm afraid in my imagination that maybe she will go into convulsions.

Mr. Nyland: You mean, is she crying all the time? You have spoiled her, haven't you. You are a bad mother then. Keep her up. Does she cry herself to sleep?

Penny: Well, I don't know.

Mr. Nyland: Have you tried it?

Penny: Sometimes.

Mr. Nyland: Walk around with her? Can you divert her attention? Can you sit her up in such a way that she has to get tired?

Penny: Well, I would let her stay up all night if she wanted to, but...

Mr. Nyland: No, no. That is not so good. But, I think that the child doesn't know where to end—it really would go on into convulsion, I'm sure about that. You have to stop it before it really gets that far. I think you can let it cry. Can't you divert it in any way?

Penny: Well, if I put her to bed I feel I should leave her there.

Mr. Nyland: Well, perhaps in this case you should *not* leave it there. Can you make it play? Can you do something, really, and let it become interested before it starts crying too much? Because if it starts to cry the eyes are closed, simply then you can't see.

Penny: Well, I do that and then I say "Okay, now..."

Mr. Nyland: Maybe it's too early—too soon. I think it requires much more patience than you're willing to give it. I think you have to suffer because you were a bad mother in spoiling the child. Do you spank it? Do you? Oh-ho-ho, what's the matter with you!

Penny: Every once in a while.

Mr. Nyland: [chuckle] Will you? Spank her every evening. [laughter] All right? [laughter]

No, you were...

Yeah, Bo.

Bo: I mean, where ...whether there's spoiling ... and then ... I mean, there is a point where ... I'm not really sure whether it's a matter of maybe we should do something and maybe we shouldn't; and then we go through a period of, like, not knowing, and then it's a pretty delicate situation.

Mr. Nyland: Sure it's delicate anyhow.

Bo: I mean, we don't ... we won't...

Mr. Nyland: Yeah. I know it's a delicate situation when it is already seventy-five percent spoiled. You have to do something extra and something very special, and it will require a great deal of patience. You've let it go, even, much too long. It is not normal for a child to get into convulsions. That's why you have to divert it's attention ... and also honestly spank it.

Penny: Well, how do I get into a state where I can be patient enough.

Mr. Nyland: Well ... hah-hah, *that* is another question. Maybe *you* have to be spanked.

Someone else can do it—you could tell it. You could pray. You could take time off before, actually honestly hope that you will be able to hold onto yourself and have enough patience. You have to make special efforts. You're not going to be, just because you happen to like ... that it may be, etc. You've got to go down on your knees, sometimes, and pray to God that He's going to give you strength. You've got to consider it the most important thing in your life, right now to take care of the child. Everything else can stop—anything that has to do with your own pleasure. The attitude of the child is your responsibility, attend to it; and do anything you like under the sun within reason, but make attempts and make yourself have patience. And, sit up and don't fall asleep with it; even if there's a tendency and you want to go to bed—no, you have a child and the child is sick, and if your eyelids drop put match sticks so that they stay open. It's important, and it's your fault. You try. You can do it if you want to, and Bo will help you.

No, no. That's still going, isn't it?

Engineer: Yea, there's one minute.

Mr. Nyland: All right. I'll see you—when? Next time, huh? For Group I—yea, tomorrow. Do I have to say anything about that? Anything? No.

End of tape